

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,854	FEHRER ET AL.	
	Examiner Ronald D. Hartman Jr.	Art Unit 2121	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ronald D. Hartman Jr. (3) _____

(2) Linda Deschere. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 4/1/06.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims 25-26.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: On or about March 1, 2006, the attorney of record, Linda Deschere, contacted the examiner of record informing the examiner that the Final office action mailed on 2/10/2006 rejected claims 25-26, but the applicant had submitted an amendment to claims 25-26 which was filed and entered to the USPTO on 2/8/2006, and therefore the Office action and the amendment apparently "crossed paths" with one another. Therefore, the examiner will treat the claims based on the amendment filed on 2/8/2006 and since claims 25-26 have been amended consistent with amendments to the other claims which allowed the other claims to be considered allowable, claims 25-26 are now considered to be allowable for at least the same rational.... .